



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

spite of custom should be rooted out of the English language. Either we should say "Yahweh," as the ancient Hebrews said, or should substitute "Lord," as did the later Jews. It is probable that pronunciation of the divine name was avoided at the time when most of the books of the Old Testament were written, hence the translation "Lord" is entirely justifiable. It is a vice of ARV that it has everywhere inserted Jehovah.

Viewed as a whole this is a better version of the Old Testament than any that has yet appeared. It marks a distinct advance upon both the British and the American Revised versions. It will be a valuable exegetical aid to Christian students by showing the traditional Jewish rendering of difficult passages, and there is no reason why it should not be read and studied in Christian churches as a better aid in getting near to the spirit of the Old Testament than any other complete version that we possess. Still it is by no means a final version. We still wait for a translation that shall be based upon a critically emended text and shall endeavor to give a correct rendering of the original without regard to tradition, Jewish, Christian, or English.

LEWIS BAYLES PATON

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HARTFORD, CONN.

THE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF JESUS¹

During the winter of 1915-16 Mr. Glover, of Cambridge University, gave a series of lectures on Jesus in many cities of India, with the purpose of promoting Christianity in this missionary field. These ten lectures, put into shape for publication in the Orient away from the accessories of scholarship, for which the author apologizes, are now presented in book form under the auspices of the British Student Christian Movement. The volume is a small one, apologetic and evangelistic in aim, theological in spirit, homiletical in content, rhetorical in style. Exclamation and interrogation points abound, and there are sharp slurs at opposing opinions and interpretations, appeals to the conservative tendency in the common mind, evasion of fundamental historical problems, smoothing over of theological difficulties. "There is nothing archaic about Plato, Virgil, Paul, or Jesus" (p. 21) indicates the non-historical point of view, the pragmatic animus of the author. Moffatt has aptly called the book "a charming impressionist study." Glover seems to have

¹*The Jesus of History.* By T. R. Glover. New York: Doran, 1917. xiv+225 pages. \$1.00.

found much inspiration in Carlyle's *Heroes and Hero Worship*; he says (p. 2) that Carlyle's lecture on "Mohammed, the Hero as Prophet," may be taken as a landmark for English people in this new historical treatment of the world's great religious teachers and leaders. Carlyle, writing in 1840, did not take Jesus as his type of prophet because at that date the general public—and probably Carlyle himself—would only think of Jesus christologically. Glover would now like to do for Jesus what Carlyle did for Mohammed—present him historically, and yet in an idealized and eulogistic way, with superlative phrases and practical evaluation. Glover proceeds to name his book *The Jesus of History*, when it is in fact a book on *The Religious Value of Jesus*. The author is uncertain about the results of the historical interpretation of Jesus, and is not overinterested in them anyway; but he is sure and enthusiastic about the religious value of Jesus—his superiority, truth, and power. He speaks of historical questions concerning Jesus which "students may discuss" (p. 138). He presents Jesus in his divinity: "We are not at all so near him as we have imagined. He eludes us, goes far out beyond what we grasp or conceive . . . we realize how little we know about Jesus" (p. 165).

The ten heads under which this interpretation of Jesus is arranged in chapters are as follows: i, "The Study of the Gospels"; ii, "Childhood and Youth"; iii, "The Man and His Mind"; iv, "The Teacher and the Disciples"; v, "The Teaching of Jesus upon God"; vi, "Jesus and Man"; vii, Jesus' Teaching upon Sin"; viii, "The Choice of the Cross"; ix, "The Christian Church in the Roman Empire"; x, "Jesus in Christian Thought." The last two chapters intentionally deal with the period subsequent to the public ministry of Jesus, on the ground that we can make an adequate estimate of the person and work of Jesus only when we include the later history which he set in motion. "The consensus of Christian opinion gives the very highest name to Jesus Christ. . . . The Church has risen in power with every real emphasis laid on Jesus Christ" (p. 213). The author does not ask us to subscribe to the classical christological doctrines of the church, but he holds that with care we can use christological theories to recover the facts which those who framed the theories intended to explain. What did they really mean to say, what had they experienced which they thought worth expressing? They were face to face with a very great new experience, and they cast about for some means of describing and explaining it (p. 215). "The historical character of Christian life and thought is surely evidence that Jesus Christ has accomplished something real; and when we get a

better hold of that, the problem of his person should be more within our reach" (p. 221). And he closes his book with the proposal that we moderns construct our own doctrine of Jesus Christ according to our own experience of him; in Herrmann's phrase, making "such a confession of the Deity of Christ as springs naturally to the lips of the man whom Jesus has already made blessed" (p. 225).

Glover does not disclose to us his own doctrine of Jesus constructed out of his own experience of Jesus. At many points in the book he seems to assume a natural rather than a supernatural Jesus. He gives no acceptance to the miracle working beyond what we can assume to be within the range of natural law. In chapter ii, where we might have expected a discussion, he makes no reference to the miraculous conception or the infancy narratives in general; he seems to hold them legendary. The doctrine of the sinlessness of Jesus seems not to be maintained, for he writes: "With every chance to see weakness in his character, they [his disciples] did not find much amiss in him" (p. 78). The problem of the messianic consciousness of Jesus is given slight attention. He says that Jesus accepted the title Messiah and used the title Son of Man messianically (p. 177). But "when the question is asked, 'Was Jesus the Messiah?' the obvious reply is, 'Which Messiah?' For there seems to have been no standard idea of the Messiah. The Messiah was, on the whole, as vague a term as, in modern politics, socialism or tariff reform. Neither of them has come; perhaps they will never come, and nobody knows what they will be till they do come. Jesus is not what they expected" (p. 68). This may be a successful, and perhaps a permissible, way of dismissing the problem of the messianic consciousness of Jesus in order to relieve modern theology and homiletics. It is certainly not a legitimate handling of the problem from the point of view of a historical interpretation of Jesus.

Glover's doctrine of the divinity of Christ is that he was conscious of "his own peculiar relation to God" (p. 177). He knew God and revealed God as no one had done before him and no one has done since. He brought men "to face the fact of God, to realize the seriousness of God and of life, and to see God. . . . Decision for God, obedience to God, that is the prime thing—action on the basis of God and of God's care for the individual" (p. 71). With regard to his death, our author holds that Jesus voluntarily chose it and that he gave to it a theological significance. "It is no martyr's death that he incurs" (p. 170). "Something must be done to touch the heart and to move the will of men, effectively; and he must do it" (p. 174). "He is the

great interpreter of God, and it is borne in upon him that only by the cross can he interpret God, make God real to us, and bring us to the very heart of God. That is his purpose" (p. 178). "He chose the cross; and in choosing it, Christians have always felt, he revealed God; and that is the center of the great act of Redemption" (p. 181). On the whole this seems to be a "moral-influence" idea of the atonement, yet by claiming a uniqueness for this act of Jesus he does not quite detach himself from the supernaturalistic doctrine of Christ's work. "Jesus Christ transcends our categories and classification" (p. 22).

Regarding the resurrection of Jesus the author also leaves the reader in uncertainty as to what he thinks: "Is it the detail or the central fact that matters? Take away the resurrection, however it happened, whatever it was, and the history of the Church is unintelligible. . . . Something happened, so tremendous and so vital that it changed, not only the character of the movement and the men—but with them the whole history of the world" (p. 178). That must then have been a supernatural event of the first magnitude; but the Gospel accounts of the resurrection of Jesus cannot be depended upon to tell us what happened. Can we only say, "Whatever it was"? If the matter stands that way it is likely that historians will prefer to find natural causes for the resurrection faith of the disciples and its influence upon early Christianity. History is not now written by postulating supernatural interventions. How long will christological doctrine survive when the New Testament supernaturalism is rejected, and some vague, undefined supernaturalism is proposed in its place? Although the Christology of the Gospel of John is more of the kind that Glover holds, he will not use that either because "the exact relations of history and interpretation in the Fourth Gospel—the methods and historical outlook of the writer—cannot yet be said to be determined" (p. 10).

The book gives only a religious study of Jesus—his religious significance. It presents no discussion of the dates, length, and course of Jesus' ministry, no consideration of the geography of the ministry, no exposition of how he related himself to the Jewish parties in his day, no treatment of the political situation and Jesus' attitude toward it, no study of the official trial of Jesus, no interpretation of his general teaching—such as is contained in the Sermon on the Mount. This teaching concerning conduct and character is not only untreated, but is repudiated. "Men, he saw, do not want precepts; they do not want ethics, morals, or rules; what they do need is to rethink God, to rediscover him, to re-explore him, to live on the basis of relation with God. . . . If Jesus

had merely put before men an ethical code, that would have been to do what the moralists had done before him—what moralists always do, with the same naïve idea that they are doing a great deal for us. His object was far more fundamental" (p. 70). This is a depreciation of ethics in general and of Jesus' ethical teaching in particular that must be rejected and refuted by philosophical and practical science and by the entire modern system of education in school and church. It is an unhistorical reading of the influence which Greek ethics has had, from Socrates to the present day, not to speak of the immeasurable and continuous benefit in the Orient of Confucian and Buddhist ethics. Certainly also the Christian religion for nineteen hundred years has kept prominent in its belief and practice the ethical teachings of Jesus, as we read them especially in the Gospel of Matthew, chapters 5-7, 10, 13, 18, and 23, together with Paul's ethical teachings in the Galatian, First Corinthian, and Roman letters. The correct affirmation concerning Jesus is precisely the opposite of Glover's statement above: Jesus saw that men *did* want (need) ethics, and he gave one of the finest, most helpful ethical messages that the world has received.

The claim of the author, in the title of the book, that he has presented to us "the Jesus of History" is not made good in his pages. From the viewpoint of a historical interpretation of Jesus the treatment is mystical, homiletical, superficial, and fragmentary. He has given useful expositions of some phases and items of the Gospel story, which students will wish to consult. But the book is not a major contribution to that great reconstruction of the Jesus of history which stands imminent as the supreme task of some surpassing New Testament scholar.

C. W. VOTAW

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

TWO NEW HARMONIES OF THE GOSPELS¹

From the University of Chicago come two Gospel harmonies, or, to follow the language of the books themselves, a *Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels* and a *Super-Harmony of the Gospels*. At least the latter title appears on the cover slip of Dr. Sharman's book, while he himself says in his prefatory statement that "the book cannot be regarded as a

¹ *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels*. By Ernest DeWitt Burton and Edgar Johnson Goodspeed. New York: Scribner, 1917. xv+275 pages. \$1.25.

Records of the Life of Jesus. By Henry Burton Sharman. New York: Doran, 1917. xix+319 pages. \$2.50.